



IN REPLY REFER TO:
L7615(YOSE-PM)

United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Yosemite National Park
P. O. Box 577
Yosemite, California 95389

Memorandum

To: William Bryan, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2012-041 Yosemite Lodge Ecological Restoration (43595)

The Executive Leadership Team has reviewed the proposed project/action and completed its environmental assessment documentation, and we have determined the following:

- There will not be any effect on threatened, endangered, or rare species and/or their critical habitat.
- There will be no historical properties affected.
- There will not be serious or long-term undesirable environmental or visual effects.

The subject proposed project, therefore, is now cleared for all NEPA and NHPA compliance requirements as presented above. Project plans and specifications are approved and construction and/or project implementation can commence.

For the proposed project actions to be within compliance requirements during construction and/or project implementation, the following mitigations must be adhered to:

- No ground disturbing activities will occur within the boundaries of archeological sites. Cultural use plants will be used during re-vegetation activities.
- If previously unidentified archeological materials are encountered during project work, please halt ground-disturbing activities and contact Sonny Montague or Laura Kirn in the Archeology Office.

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 43595.

//Edward J. Walls// acting
Don L. Neubacher

Enclosure (with attachments)

cc: Statutory Compliance File

Letter *The signed original of this document is on file at the
Environmental Planning and Compliance Office in
Yosemite National Park.* - PEPC ID: 43595



Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: 2012-041 Yosemite Lodge Ecological Restoration

PEPC Project Number: 43595

Project Description:

Project Description: The purpose of this project is to perform ecological restoration work on the concessioner's land assignment at Yosemite Lodge. The project goal is to make a significant improvement in the general appearance and the ecological health of the environment within the concessioner's (Delaware North Corporation (DNC)) land assignment. Periodic maintenance of the restoration efforts will occur.

Ecological Restoration: The restoration work includes soil de-compaction (outside of archeologically-sensitive areas), removal of dirt roads, collection and spreading of duff in restored areas and transplanting of native plants taken from the immediate area. The restoration work will be performed using hand tools. DNC proposes the use of metal tines pulled by a bobcat to de-compact the area directly south of the 3200 building, between the bike path and building, due to the extent of the compacted soil. This area was previously impacted by the installation of the underground utility system and vehicle traffic. In other areas slated for de-compaction, shovels will be used. Soil disruption of up to six inches will occur in the de-compaction processes. DNC proposes using logs, tangled branches, and rock gathered from Pohono Pit for all barriers. Note: in archeologically-sensitive areas, rock will be placed on the ground surface and not buried. Duff will be gathered locally and spread on restored areas. DNC will adhere to the Yosemite Valley Design Guidelines for information pertinent to the Yosemite Lodge area. DNC will also work with park Resources Management and Science staff to identify possible plants and the best method for transplanting. Where possible, culturally significant plants will be used in re-vegetation.

Project Background: This DNC proposal is to emulate success from the High Sierra Camp ecological restoration efforts

Project Goals:

- Remove unwanted and unsightly dirt roads
- Enhance guests' experience by improving aesthetics
- Provide educational opportunities for guests, concessioner employees, associates and volunteers
- Provide opportunity for park partners, DNC associates and managers to participate in a team building volunteer project
- Increase vegetation on the site

Scope of Work:

- De-compaction of the soil will take place to increase water absorption, decrease run-off and help increase vegetation cover. To achieve these goals, hand tools (such as shovels) and metal tines (on the dirt roads) will be used to de-compact the soil. Soil disruption 6 inches deep will occur with this work. No ground disturbance would occur in archeologically-sensitive areas.

- Remove and restore the dirt roads: The dirt roads within the land assignment will be removed, blocked from further use and restored.
- Volunteers will perform the work. DNC expects to work with Yosemite Conservancy to recruit 10 - 15 volunteers for five days. The volunteers will be supervised by Debora Sanches and Mark Gallagher (DNC).

Project Locations:

Mariposa County, CA

Mitigations:

- No ground disturbing activities will occur within the boundaries of archeological sites. Cultural use plants will be used during re-vegetation activities.
- If previously unidentified archeological materials are encountered during project work, please halt ground-disturbing activities and contact Sonny Montague or Laura Kirn in the Archeology Office.

Describe the category used to exclude action from further NEPA analysis and indicate the number of the category (see Section 3-4 of DO-12):

C.16 Landscaping and landscape maintenance in previously disturbed or developed areas.

On the basis of the environmental impact information in the statutory compliance file, with which I am familiar, I am categorically excluding the described project from further NEPA analysis. No exceptional circumstances (e.g. all boxes in the ESF are marked "no") or conditions in Section 3-6 apply, and the action is fully described in Section 3-4 of DO-12.

Superintendent: //Edward J. Walls// acting **Date:** 8/8/13
Don L. Neubacher

*The signed original of this document is on file at the
Environmental Planning and Compliance Office in
Yosemite National Park.*



National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Yosemite National Park
Date: 07/30/2013

ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: 07/30/2013

Updated May 2007 - per 2004 Departmental Manual revisions and proposed Director's Order 12 changes

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2012-041 Yosemite Lodge Ecological Restoration
PEPC Project Number: 43595
Project Type: Resource Management Plan/Site Plan (RMP)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: William Bryan

Is project a hot topic (controversial or sensitive issues that should be brought to attention of Regional Director)? No

B. RESOURCE EFFECTS TO CONSIDER:

Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources	No Effect	Negligible Effects	Minor Effects	Exceeds Minor Effects	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
1. Geologic resources – soils, bedrock, streambeds, etc.		Negligible			Soil de-compaction up to six inches deep and transplanting up to 12 inches deep.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality	No				
4. Soundscapes	No				
5. Water quality or quantity	No				
6. Streamflow characteristics	No				

Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources	No Effect	Negligible Effects	Minor Effects	Exceeds Minor Effects	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
7. Marine or estuarine resources	No				
8. Floodplains or wetlands	No				
9. Land use, including occupancy, income, values, ownership, type of use	No				
10. Rare or unusual vegetation – old growth timber, riparian, alpine	No				
11. Species of special concern (plant or animal; state or federal listed or proposed for listing) or their habitat	No				
12. Unique ecosystems, biosphere reserves, World Heritage Sites	No				Yosemite National Park is World Heritage Site.
13. Unique or important wildlife or wildlife habitat	No				
14. Unique or important fish or fish habitat	No				
15. Introduce or promote non-native species (plant or animal)	No				
16. Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc.	No				

Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources	No Effect	Negligible Effects	Minor Effects	Exceeds Minor Effects	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources	No				The visitor experience will be enhanced by the improved landscaped aesthetics.
18. Archeological resources		Negligible			Yosemite Valley Archeological District
19. Prehistoric/historic structure	No				
20. Cultural landscapes	No				Yosemite Valley Historic District
21. Ethnographic resources		Negligible			No ground disturbing activities will occur within the boundaries of archeological sites. Cultural use plants will be used during re-vegetation activities.
22. Museum collections (objects, specimens, and archival and manuscript collections)	No				
23. Socioeconomics, including employment, occupation, income changes, tax base, infrastructure	No				
24. Minority and low income populations, ethnography, size, migration patterns, etc.	No				
25. Energy resources	No				
26. Other agency or tribal land use plans or policies	No				

Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources	No Effect	Negligible Effects	Minor Effects	Exceeds Minor Effects	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
27. Resource, including energy, conservation potential, sustainability	No				
28. Urban quality, gateway communities, etc.	No				
29. Long-term management of resources or land/resource productivity	No				
30. Other important environment resources (e.g. geothermal, paleontological resources)?	No				

C. MANDATORY CRITERIA

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
A. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?		No		
B. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation, or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas?		No		
C. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve		No		

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E))?				
D. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		No		
E. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?		No		
F. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		No		
G. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, as determined by either the bureau or office?		No		
H. Have significant impacts on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?		No		
I. Violate a federal law, or a state, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		No		
J. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		No		
K. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites		No		

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
(Executive Order 13007)?				
L. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?		No		

D. OTHER INFORMATION

1. Are personnel preparing this form familiar with the site? Yes
- 1.A. Did personnel conduct a site visit? No
2. Is the project in an approved plan such as a General Management Plan or an Implementation Plan with an accompanying NEPA document? No
3. Are there any interested or affected agencies or parties? Yes
4. Has consultation with all affected agencies or tribes been completed? Yes
5. Are there any connected, cumulative, or similar actions as part of the proposed action? (*e.g., other development projects in area or identified in GMP, adequate/available utilities to accomplish project*) No

E. INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM SIGNATORIES

<u>Interdisciplinary Team</u>	<u>Field of Expertise</u>
Don L. Neubacher	Superintendent
Michael Gauthier	Chief of Staff
Kathleen Morse	Chief of Planning
Randy Fong	Chief of Project Management
Teri Austin	Chief of Administration Management
Ed Walls	Chief of Facilities Management
Linda C. Mazzu	Chief of Resources Management & Science
Kris Kirby	Chief of Business and Revenue Management
Tom Medema	Chief of Interpretation and Education
Kevin Killian	Acting Chief of Visitor and Resource Protection
Ron Gaunt	Project Leader
Madelyn Ruffner	Acting Environmental Planning and Compliance Program Manager
Renea Kennec	NEPA Specialist

F. SUPERVISORY SIGNATORY

Based on the environmental impact information contained in the statutory compliance file and in this environmental screening form, environmental documentation for this stage of the subject project is complete.

Recommended:

Compliance Specialists	Date
<u>//Renea Kennec//</u> Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennec	<u>8/1/13</u>
<u>//Madelyn Ruffner//</u> Acting Compliance Program Manager – Madelyn Ruffner	<u>8/1/13</u>
<u>//Madelyn Ruffner//acting</u> Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	<u>8/5/13</u>

Approved:

Superintendent	Date
<u>//Edward J. Walls// acting</u> Don L. Neubacher	<u>8/8/13</u>

*The signed original of this document is on file at the
Environmental Planning and Compliance Office in
Yosemite National Park.*



PARK ESF ADDENDUM

Today's Date: July 30, 2013

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2012-041 Yosemite Lodge Ecological Restoration
PEPC Project Number: 43595
Project Type: Resource Management Plan/Site Plan (RMP)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: William Bryan

PARK ESF ADDENDUM QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES CHECKLIST				
Listed or proposed threatened or endangered species (Federal or State)?		No		
Species of special concern (Federal or State)?		No		
Park rare plants or vegetation?		No		
Potential habitat for any special-status species listed above?		No		
NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT CHECKLIST				
Entail ground disturbance?	Yes			Soil de-compaction up to six inches deep and transplanting up to 12 inches deep.
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?	Yes			No ground disturbing activities will occur within the boundaries of archeological sites.
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		No		
Has a National Register form been completed?			N/A	

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
Are there any structures on the park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?		No		
WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST				
Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor?	Yes			Merced River
Fall within the bed and banks AND will affect the free-flow of the river?		No		
Have the possibility of affecting water quality of the area?		No		
Remain consistent with its river segment classification?	Yes			
Fall on a tributary of a Wild and Scenic River?		No		
Will the project encroach or intrude upon the Wild and Scenic River corridor?		No		
Will the project unreasonably diminish scenic, recreational, or fish and wildlife values?		No		
Consistent with the provisions in the Merced River Plan Settlement Agreement?	Yes			
WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST				
Within designated Wilderness?		No		
Within a Potential Wilderness Addition?		No		



ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park

2. **Project Description:**

Project Name: 2012-041 Yosemite Lodge Ecological Restoration

Prepared by: Renea Kennec

Date Prepared: 07/30/2013

Telephone: 209-379-1038

PEPC Project Number: 43595

Area of potential effects (as defined in 36 CFR 800.16[d])

Yosemite Valley Archeological District; Yosemite Valley Historic District

3. **Has the area of potential effects been surveyed to identify historic properties?**

☐ No

☒ Yes

Source or reference:

4. **Potentially Affected Resource(s):**

Archeological resources affected:

Name and numbers: Yosemite Valley Archeological District

NR status: 1 - Listed in Register and documented

Cultural Landscapes Affected:

Name and numbers: Yosemite Valley Historic District

NR status: 1 - Listed in Register and documented

Name and numbers: Resources of Cultural Significance (un-evaluated)

Ethnographic Resources Affected:

Name and number(s): Resources of Cultural Significance (un-evaluated)

Location:

NR status:

5. **The proposed action will: (check as many as apply)**

☒ No ☐ Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure

<u>No</u>	Replace historic features/elements in kind
<u>No</u>	Add non-historic features/elements to a historic structure
<u>No</u>	Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment (inc. terrain)
<u>No</u>	Add non-historic features/elements (inc. visual, audible, or atmospheric) to a historic setting or cultural landscape
<u>No</u>	Disturb, destroy, or make archeological resources inaccessible
<u>No</u>	Disturb, destroy, or make ethnographic resources inaccessible
<u>Yes</u>	Potentially affect presently unidentified cultural resources
<u>No</u>	Begin or contribute to deterioration of historic features, terrain, setting, landscape elements, or archeological or ethnographic resources
<u>No</u>	Involve a real property transaction (exchange, sale, or lease of land or structures)
	Other (please specify): _____

6. Supporting Study Data:

(Attach if feasible; if action is in a plan, EA or EIS, give name and project or page number.)

B. REVIEWS BY CULTURAL RESOURCE SPECIALISTS

The park 106 coordinator requested review by the park's cultural resource specialist/advisors as indicated by check-off boxes or as follows:

[X] Archeologist
 Name: Sonny Montague
 Date: 07/15/2013

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []

Assessment of Effect: ☐ No Potential to Cause Effect ☐ No Historic Properties
 Affected ☒ No Adverse Effect ☐ Adverse Effect ☐ Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: If previously unidentified archeological materials are encountered during project work, please halt ground-disturbing activities and contact Sonny Montague or Laura Kirn in the Archeology Office.

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

[X] Historical Architect
 Name: Paul Stephens
 Date: 07/15/2013

Comments: The proposed work will not effect the buildings on site. This complex has not been evaluated for eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []

Assessment of Effect: ☒ No Potential to Cause Effect ☐ No Historic Properties

Affected ☐ No Adverse Effect ☐ Adverse Effect ☐ Streamlined Review
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

[X] Anthropologist
Name: Jennifer Hardin
Date: 07/30/2013

Comments: The proposed project will occur in culturally significant that contain ethnographic resources valued by traditionally associated tribal groups. The project has been redesigned to eliminate all ground disturbing activities in archeological sites in order to avoid impacts to ethnographic resources.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance [☐]

Assessment of Effect: ☐ No Potential to Cause Effect ☐ No Historic Properties
Affected ☒ No Adverse Effect ☐ Adverse Effect ☐ Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: No ground disturbing activities will occur within the boundaries of archeological sites. Cultural use plants will be used during revegetation activities.

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

[X] Historical Landscape Architect
Name: Kevin McCardle
Date: 07/15/2013

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance [☐]

Assessment of Effect: ☐ No Potential to Cause Effect ☐ No Historic Properties
Affected ☒ No Adverse Effect ☐ Adverse Effect ☐ Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

No Reviews From: Curator, Historian, 106 Advisor, Other Advisor

C. PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR'S REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Assessment of Effect:

☐ No Potential to Cause Effects
☐ No Historic Properties Affected
☒ No Adverse Effect
☐ Adverse Effect

2. Documentation Method:

[☐] A. STANDARD 36 CFR PART 800 CONSULTATION
Further consultation under 36 CFR Part 800 is needed.

☐ B. STREAMLINED REVIEW UNDER THE 2008 SERVICEWIDE PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT (PA)

The above action meets all conditions for a streamlined review under section III of the 2008 Servicewide PA for Section 106 compliance.

APPLICABLE STREAMLINED REVIEW Criteria
(Specify 1-16 of the list of streamlined review criteria.)

☐ C. PLAN-RELATED UNDERTAKING

Consultation and review of the proposed undertaking were completed in the context of a plan review process, in accordance with the 2008 Servicewide PA and 36 CFR Part 800.
Specify plan/EA/EIS:

☒ D. UNDERTAKING RELATED TO ANOTHER AGREEMENT

The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under another document such as a statewide agreement established in accord with 36 CFR 800.7 or counterpart regulations.
Specify: 1999 Programmatic Agreement

☐ E. COMBINED NEPA/NHPA Document

Documentation is required for the preparation of an EA/FONSI or an EIS/ROD has been developed and used so as also to meet the requirements of 36 CFR 800.3 through 800.6

☐ G. Memo to SHPO/THPO

☐ H. Memo to ACHP

3. Additional Consulting Parties Information:

Additional Consulting Parties: No

4. Stipulations and Conditions:

Following are listed any stipulations or conditions necessary to ensure that the assessment of effect above is consistent with 36 CFR Part 800 criteria of effect or to avoid or reduce potential adverse effects.

5. Mitigations/Treatment Measures:

**Measures to prevent or minimize loss or impairment of historic/prehistoric properties:
(Remember that setting, location, and use may be relevant.)**

- Assessment of Effect - No ground disturbing activities will occur within the boundaries of archeological sites. Cultural use plants will be used during re-vegetation activities.
- Assessment of Effect - If previously unidentified archeological materials are encountered during project work, please halt ground-disturbing activities and contact Sonny Montague or Laura Kirn in the Archeology Office.

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Acting Historic Preservation Officer:

Kimball

Koch

//Kimball Koch//

Date: 7/31/13

E. SUPERINTENDENT'S APPROVAL

The proposed work conforms to the NPS *Management Policies* and *Cultural Resource Management Guideline*, and I have reviewed and approve the recommendations, stipulations, or conditions noted in Section C of this form.

Superintendent: //Edward J. Walls// acting

Date: 8/8/13

Don L. Neubacher

*The signed original of this document is on file at the
Environmental Planning and Compliance Office in
Yosemite National Park.*